arXiv:1408.2166v1 [math.RT] 9 Aug 2014

INDECOMPOSABLE MODULES OF 2-STEP SOLVABLE LIE ALGEBRAS IN ARBITRARY CHARACTERISTIC

LEANDRO CAGLIERO AND FERNANDO SZECHTMAN

Abstract. Let F be an algebraically closed field and consider the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \langle x \rangle \ltimes \mathfrak{a}$, where $ad\, x$ acts diagonalizably on the abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$. Refer to a $\mathfrak{g}$-module as admissible if $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ acts via nilpotent operators on it, which is automatic if $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$. In this paper we classify all indecomposable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules U which are admissible as well as uniserial, in the sense that U has a unique composition series.

1. Introduction

We fix throughout an arbitrary field F. All vector spaces, including all Lie algebras and their modules, are assumed to be finite dimensional over F.

If we consider the problem of classifying all indecomposable modules of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, there are two well-known and opposite instances where a solution is available.

In the first case $\mathfrak{g} = \langle x \rangle$ is 1-dimensional. Then a $\mathfrak{g}$-module U is indecomposable if and only if x acts on U via the companion matrix of the power of an irreducible polynomial. In particular, when F is algebraically closed, this means that x acts on U through a Jordan block.

In the second case F is algebraically closed of characteristic 0 and $\mathfrak{g}$ is semisimple. Then the indecomposable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are the irreducible $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, which can be classified by their highest weights (see [H]).

In general, the problem seems to be untractable, as discussed in [GP] for abelian Lie algebras of dimension ≥ 2, in [S] for the 3-dimensional complex euclidean Lie algebra $\mathfrak{e}(2)$, and in [M] for virtually any complex Lie algebra other than semisimple or 1-dimensional.

In spite of the difficulties in achieving a classification, various families of indecomposable modules over various types of non-semisimple complex Lie algebras have been constructed and classified in recent years. See, for instance, [CMS], [CM], [DG], [DP], [DKR] and [J].

One may hope to contribute to the classification problem by restricting attention to certain types of indecomposable modules, defined by suitable structural properties. In a sense, the simplest type of indecomposable module, other than irreducible, is a uniserial module, i.e., one possessing a unique composition series.

In trying to classify all uniserial modules of an abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the first observation is that when $\dim(\mathfrak{g}) = 1$ then uniserial means indecomposable, a case

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 17B10.

Key words and phrases. Indecomposable module; Uniserial module; Lie algebra.

The first author was supported in part by CONICET and SECYT-UNC grants.

The second author was supported in part by an NSERC discovery grant.

considered above. If $\dim(\mathfrak{g}) \geq 2$ we immediately run into technical problems, due to the existence of field extensions without a primitive element (see [Mc], Ch. 1). However, it is shown in [CS2] that if F is a sufficiently large perfect field and U is a uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module then there is $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that U is a uniserial $F[x]$-module. Thus, relative to a suitable basis, the action of x on U can be represented by the companion matrix of the power of an irreducible polynomial and every other element of $\mathfrak{g}$ can be represented as a polynomial in this matrix. The proof of this result is quite technical, relying on subtle results from Galois theory and the existence and uniqueness of the Jordan-Chevalley decomposition over perfect fields. We begin this paper by giving an elementary proof, under the stronger assumption that F is algebraically closed, in which case we obtain the sharper conclusion that, if $\mathcal{B}$ is any basis of $\mathfrak{g}$, then x can be taken from $\mathcal{B}$, which is certainly false for more general perfect fields (look at $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{2},\sqrt{3}]$ as a module over the 2-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \langle\sqrt{2},\sqrt{3}\rangle$).

Let us consider next uniserial modules over a non-abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. For $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes V(m)$, where $V(m)$ is the irreducible $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$-module of highest weight $m \geq 1$, a complete solution was achieved in [CS]. The classification of all uniserial $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes V(m)$-modules is intimately related to the problem of determining all non-trivial zeros of the Racah-Wigner $6j$-symbol within certain parameters, which is, in general, a fairly difficult problem (see [R] and [L]). We remark that in the special case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes V(1)$, the classification of uniserial and far more general indecomposable modules had been previously obtained in [P].

Suppose next $\mathfrak{g} = \langle x\rangle \ltimes \mathfrak{a}$, where $ad\, x$ acts diagonalizably on the abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$. In this case, a full classification of uniserial and far more general indecomposable $\mathfrak{g}$-modules was obtained in [CS3] under the only assumption that F have characteristic 0. This classification fails completely in prime characteristic, the main reason being the failure of Lie's theorem and, as a result, the failure of $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ to act trivially on an irreducible $\mathfrak{g}$-module. Let us refer to a $\mathfrak{g}$-module U as admissible if $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ acts on U via nilpotent operators, which is automatic if $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$. In this paper we classify all admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-modules of composition length $m \geq 1$ when F is algebraically closed, whatever the characteristic of F. If $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$ or $\mathrm{char}(F) = p \geq m$ our results match those from [CS3], although, taking advantage of the fact that F is algebraically closed, are proofs are drastically simpler. When F has prime characteristic $p < m$ each of the isomorphism of classes that arise when $p \geq m$ now split into infinitely distinct classes, according to the orbits of an intransitive group action, while, on the other hand, infinitely many new isomorphism classes arise which only exist when $p < m$.

2. Uniserial families of commuting operators

It will be convenient to use a slightly simpler language than above. A family $\mathcal{S}$ of endomorphisms of a non-zero vector space V is said to be uniserial if the $\mathcal{S}$-invariant subspaces of V form a chain under inclusion.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a uniserial family of operators acting on a non-zero vector space V. Suppose that there is a basis of V relative to which every element of $\mathcal{S}$ can be represented by an upper triangular matrix. Then none of the entries along the first superdiagonal of these matrices is identically 0.*

Proof. Given any non-zero (resp. proper) $\mathcal{S}$-invariant subspace W of V we see that $\mathcal{S}$ induces a uniserial family of linear operators on W (resp. V/W). Thus, if the result is false, we obtain a uniserial family of 2×2 diagonal matrices, which is absurd. □

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $A \in M_m(F)$ is upper triangular. Then there is $P \in \mathrm{GL}_m(F)$ such that P is upper triangular with diagonal entries equal to 1 and $B = P^{-1}AP$ satisfies: if $B_{ii} \neq B_{jj}$ then $B_{ij} = 0$.*

Proof. We will clear all required blocks of A by means of transformations

$$T \mapsto (I - \alpha E^{ij})T(I + \alpha E^{ij}),$$

where $T \in M_m(F)$, $i < j$ and $\alpha \in F$, proceeding upwards one row at a time and, within each row, from left to right one column at a time.

Suppose that C was obtained from A by means of a sequence of these transformations and satisfies the following: for some $1 \leq i < n$, all required entries of C are 0 below row i, and there is $i < j \leq n$ such that if $i < k < j$ and $C_{ii} \neq C_{kk}$ then $C_{ik} = 0$. Set

$$D = (I - \alpha E^{ij})C(I + \alpha E^{ij}),$$

where $\alpha = 0$ if $C_{ii} = C_{jj}$ and $\alpha = C_{ij}/(C_{jj} - C_{ii})$ otherwise. Then the entries of D and C coincide below row i as well as within row i but to the left of position (i, j). Moreover, $D_{ij} = 0$ if $D_{ii} \neq D_{jj}$. We may thus continue this process and find B as required. □

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose F is algebraically closed field and let $\mathcal{S} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be a uniserial family of commuting endomorphisms of a non-zero vector space V. Then there is an index $1 \leq i \leq n$ and a basis of V relative to which x_i is represented by an upper triangular Jordan block $J_m(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in F$, and all other x_j are represented by a polynomial in $J_m(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Since F is algebraically closed and $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ commute there is a basis of V relative to which every x_i is represented by an upper triangular matrix, say A_i.

Given $1 \leq j \leq n$, we claim that all eigenvalues of A_j are equal. If not, A_j has a principal 2×2 submatrix, corresponding to entries $i, i+1$, equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a \neq b$. By Lemma 2.2, we may assume that $c = 0$. Since A_j commutes with all A_k, it follows that entry $(i, i+1)$ of every A_k is 0, which contradicts Lemma 2.1. This proves the claim.

By Lemma 2.1, there is an index i satisfying $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that entry $(1, 2)$ of A_i is not 0. Since $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ commute, Lemma 2.1 implies that all other entries of the first superdiagonal of A_i are non-zero. Conjugating by a suitable matrix, we may assume that $A_i = J_m(\alpha)$, where α is the only eigenvalue of A_i. Since the only matrices commuting with $J_m(\alpha)$ are polynomials in it, the result follows. □

3. Uniserial modules over 2-step solvable Lie algebras

We assume henceforth that F is algebraically closed and that $\mathfrak{g} = \langle x \rangle \ltimes \mathfrak{a}$, where $\operatorname{ad} x$ acts diagonalizably on the abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$. If U is a uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module acted upon trivially by $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ then U is a uniserial module over the abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, a case described in Theorem 2.3. We may thus restrict attention

to the case when U is admissible but not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$. We reiterate the observation made in the Introduction that, thanks to Lie's theorem, the condition that U be admissible is utterly redundant when $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$.

Throughout this section we let $J_m(0)$ stand for the upper triangular $m\times m$ Jordan block with eigenvalue 0. Moreover, given $\delta\in F$, we let $\mathfrak{a}(\delta)=\{v\in\mathfrak{a}\,|\,[x,v]=\delta v\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let p be a prime and suppose F has characteristic 0 or p. Given $m\geq 1$, let G be the unipotent part of unit group of $F[J]$, $J=J_m(0)$, namely the abelian subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_m(F)$ formed by all $I+f(J)$ such that $f\in F[X]$ has no constant term. Further, given $\alpha\in F$, set $D=\mathrm{diag}(\alpha,\alpha-1,\dots,\alpha-(m-1))$ and let $\mathcal{Y}$ be the subset of $M_m(F)$ of all $D+f(J)$, where $f\in F[X]$ has no constant term. Then*

(1) *G acts on $\mathcal{Y}$ by conjugation.*

(2) *If $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$ then the stabilizer G_Y of any $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$ is trivial.*

(3) *If $\mathrm{char}(F)=p$ and $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$ then G_Y consists of all $I+h(J^p)$ such that $h\in F[X]$ has no constant term. In particular, if $p\geq m$ then G_Y is trivial.*

(4) *If $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$ or $\mathrm{char}(F)=p\geq m$ then the action of G on $\mathcal{Y}$ is regular.*

(5) *If $\mathrm{char}(F)=p$ then $D+F[J^p]J$ a set of representatives for the action of G on $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. Note first of all that

$$[D,J]=J. \tag{3.1}$$

Given $T\in G$, set $E=TDT^{-1}$. Clearly $TJT^{-1}=J$, so (3.1) yields $[E,J]=J$. Thus $E-D\in F[J]$, the centralizer of J in $M_m(F)$. But E and D have the same diagonal entries, so $E=D+f(J)$, where $f\in F[X]$ has no constant term. This shows that $\mathcal{Y}$ is stable under conjugation by G and gives (1).

It is readily seen that all $Y\in\mathcal{Y}$ have the same stabilizer in G. Now by (3.1)

$$[D,J^k]=kJ^k,\quad k\geq 0,$$

whence

$$[D,g(J)]=g'(J)J,\quad g\in F[X], \tag{3.2}$$

where g' is the formal derivative of g. We apply (3.2) to the case $g=1+f$, where $f\in F[X]$ has no constant term and, moreover, $f=0$ or $\deg(f)<m$. Then $[D,I+f(J)]=0$ if and only if $X^{m-1}|f'$, i.e., $f'=0$. If $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$ this means $f=0$, while if $\mathrm{char}(F)=p$ it means $f(X)=h(X^p)$, where $h\in F[X]$ has no constant term. This proves (2) and (3).

Suppose next that $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$ or $\mathrm{char}(F)=p\geq m$. To see that G acts transitively on $\mathcal{Y}$, let $Y=D+f(J)\in\mathcal{Y}$, where $f\in F[X]$ has no constant term. Then $[Y,J]=J$. Moreover, Y and D have the same diagonal entries, which are *distinct*. We infer from Lemma 2.2 the existence of an upper triangular matrix $P\in\mathrm{GL}_m(F)$ with diagonal entries equal to 1 such that $P^{-1}YP=D$. Set $L=P^{-1}JP$. It follows from (3.1) that $[D,L]=L$. Our assumption on F implies that the only matrices in $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ that are eigenvectors for $\mathrm{ad}\,D$ with eigenvalue 1 are the conjugates of J by a diagonal matrix. But P has diagonal entries equal to 1, so the entries along the first superdiagonal of L are equal to 1. This shows that $L=J$. Therefore $[P,J]=0$, which implies $P\in G$. This proves (4).

Given $g \in F[X]$ with no constant term, we can use (3.2) to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}(I-g(J))^{-1}D(I-g(J)) &= (I+g(J)+\cdots+g(J)^{m-1})D(I-g(J)) \\ &= D-(I+g(J)+\cdots+g(J)^{m-1})g'(J)J.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Now, given $T \in G$, we have

$$T=(I-a_1J)(I-a_2J^2)\cdots(I-a_{m-1}J^{m-1})$$

for unique $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{m-1} \in F$. Thus, every G-conjugate of D can be obtained by successively conjugating D by $I-a_1J, I-a_2J^2, \ldots, I-a_{m-1}J^{m-1}$. This can be computed by means of (3.3), to obtain

$$T^{-1}DT = D-(b_1J+b_2J^2+\cdots+b_{m-1}J^{m-1}),$$

$$b_k = \sum_{d|k} d a_d^{k/d}, \quad 1 \le k < m. \tag{3.4}$$

Suppose $\mathrm{char}(F)=p$. Thus, if $1 \le k < m$, $d|k$ and $p|d$, then a_d is not present in b_k. It follows from (3.4) that if $b_i = 0$ for all $i \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ then all $b_1, \ldots, b_{m-1}$ are equal to 0. This shows that the elements of $D+F[J^p]J$ are in distinct G-orbits. On the other hand, given any $c_1, \ldots, c_{m-1} \in F$ we can recursively find a_i, with $1 \le i < m$ relatively prime to p, so that $b_i = c_i$ for all such i. This shows that every element of $\mathcal{Y}$ is G-conjugate to one in $D+F[J^p]J$, which completes the proof of (5). □

Proposition 3.2. *Let U be an admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module of composition length m not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$. Then $m = \dim(U) > 1$. Moreover, after replacing x by a suitable scalar multiple, there is an eigenvector $v \in \mathfrak{a}$ of $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ of eigenvalue 1 and a basis of U relative to which x is represented by an upper triangular matrix $Y \in \mathfrak{gl}(m)$ with diagonal entries $\alpha, \alpha-1, \cdots, \alpha-(m-1)$ for some $\alpha \in F$ and v is represented by $J = J_m(0)$.*

Moreover, let $D = \mathrm{diag}(\alpha, \alpha-1, \ldots, \alpha-(m-1))$. If $\mathrm{char}(F)=0$ we can take $Y=D$, while if F has prime characteristic p we can take $Y \in D+F[J^p]J$.

Proof. Let $0 = U_1 \subset U_1 \subset \cdots \subset U_m$ be a composition series of U. Given any $1 \le i \le m$ set $V_i = U_i/U_{i-1}$ and $W_i = \{v \in V_i \mid [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]v = 0\}$. As $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$, it follows that W_i is a $\mathfrak{g}$-invariant subspace of V_i. Since U is admissible $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ acts via nilpotent operators on V_i, so $W_i \neq 0$. But V_i is irreducible, so $V_i = W_i$. Thus V_i is an irreducible module over the abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$. Since F is algebraically closed, we deduce that $\dim(V_i) = 1$. As this happens to every i, we infer $\dim(U) = m$. But U itself is not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$, so $m > 1$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{B}_m$ be a basis of U such that $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \cdots \mathcal{B}_i$ is a basis of U_i for each $1 \le i \le m$. Then, relative to $\mathcal{B}$, every $y \in \mathfrak{g}$ is represented by an upper triangular matrix $M(y) \in \mathfrak{gl}(m)$, so $M(y)$ is strictly upper triangular for every $y \in [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$. Let $A = M(x)$. By Lemma 2.2 we may assume that $A_{ij} = 0$ whenever $A_{ii} \neq A_{jj}$ and we will make this assumption.

We claim that no two consecutive diagonal entries of A are equal. Suppose, if possible, that this is false.

Case 1. All diagonal entries of A are the same.

Since $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ acts diagonalizably on $\mathfrak{a}$, it is clear that $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ is the sum of all $\mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ with $\delta \neq 0$. As $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ does not act trivially on U, there is a non-zero $\delta \in F$ and a non-zero $y \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ such that $yU \neq 0$. Thus $[x,y]U \neq 0$ and a fortiori $M(y) \neq 0$.

Therefore δ is an eigenvalue when $\operatorname{ad} A$ acts $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$. On the other hand, all diagonal entries of A are equal, so $\operatorname{ad} A$ acts nilpotently on $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$, whence all eigenvalues when $\operatorname{ad} A$ acts on $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ are equal to 0, a contradiction.

Case 2. A has a triple of diagonal entries (a, a, b), say in positions $i, i+1, i+2$, where $a \neq b$.

Given $y \in \mathfrak{g}$ let $N(y)$ (resp. $P(y)$) be the 2×2 (resp. 3×3) submatrix of $M(y)$ corresponding to rows and columns $i, i+1$ (resp. $i, i+1, i+2$).

Clearly, entry $(i, i+1)$ of $M(y)$ is 0 for all $y \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$, $\delta \neq 0$. Thus U_{i+1}/U_{i-1} is a uniserial module over the abelian Lie algebra $\langle x \rangle \oplus \mathfrak{a}(0)$, so by Theorem 2.3 the diagonal entries of $N(y)$ are equal for every $y \in \langle x \rangle \oplus \mathfrak{a}(0)$.

Since $A_{i+1,i+2} = 0$, Lemma 2.1 implies that entry $(i+1, i+2)$ of $M(y)$ must be non-zero for some $y \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$. As $a \neq b$, we see that necessarily $\delta \neq 0$. Thus

$$P(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & d \\ 0 & 0 & e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $e \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1, either $A_{i,i+1} \neq 0$ or else entry $(i, i+1)$ of some $M(z)$, $z \in \mathfrak{a}(0)$, must be non-zero.

Suppose first that $A_{i,i+1} \neq 0$. Then

$$P(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a & c & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c \neq 0$. It follows that entries $(i, i+2)$ and $(i+1, i+2)$ of $[A, M(y)]$ are respectively equal to $(a-b)d + ce$ and $(a-b)e$. But $[A, M(y)] = \delta M(y)$, so $a - b = \delta$, which implies $ce = 0$, a contradiction.

Suppose next $A_{i,i+1} = 0$ but entry $(i, i+1)$ of $M(z)$ is non-zero form some $z \in \mathfrak{a}(0)$. From $[A, M(z)] = 0$ we infer that entries $(i, i+2)$ and $(i+1, i+2)$ of $M(z)$ are equal to 0. Thus

$$P(z) = \begin{pmatrix} f & k & 0 \\ 0 & f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g \end{pmatrix},$$

where $k \neq 0$. From $[M(y), M(z)] = 0$ we deduce $g = f$ and a fortiori $ke = 0$, a contradiction.

Case 3. A has a triple of diagonal entries (b, a, a), say in positions $i, i+1, i+2$, where $a \neq b$.

This case can be handled as above, interchanging the roles of $i, i+1$ by those of $i+1, i+2$.

This proves the claim. Since all consecutive diagonal entries of A are distinct, all entries along the first superdiagonal of A are equal to 0. By Lemma 2.1 entry $(1, 2)$ of some $M(v)$, $v \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$, must be non-zero. Clearly $\delta \neq 0$. Since all $M(z)$, $z \in \mathfrak{a}$, commute, Lemma 2.1 implies that all entries along the first superdiagonal of the same $M(v)$ are non-zero. Replace x by $\delta^{-1}x$. Then $[x, v] = v$ forces A to have diagonal entries $\alpha, \alpha - 1, \dots, \alpha - (m-1)$ for some $\alpha \in F$.

Conjugating all $M(z)$, $z \in \mathfrak{g}$, by a suitable upper triangular matrix results in a new matrix representation $z \mapsto Q(z)$ such $Q(v) = J$ and $Q(x) = Y$ has the same diagonal entries $\alpha, \alpha - 1, \dots, \alpha - (m-1)$ as D. Since $[Y - D, J] = 0$ and the

centralizer of J in $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ is $F[J]$, it follows that $Y = D + f(J)$, where $f \in F[X]$ has no constant term. Now apply Proposition 3.1. □

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$ *or* $\mathrm{char}(F) = p \geq m$. *Assume that* 1 *is an eigenvalue when* $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ *acts on* $\mathfrak{a}$ *and let* $v \in \mathfrak{a}$ *be a corresponding eiegenvalue. Given* $m > 1$ *and* $\alpha \in F$, *set* $D = \mathrm{diag}(\alpha, \alpha - 1, \ldots, \alpha - (m-1))$ *and* $J = J_m(0)$, *and let* $f^i : \mathfrak{a}(i) \to F$, $0 \leq i < m$, *be linear functionals subject only to* $f^1(v) = 1$. *Then the linear map* $R : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{gl}(m)$ *defined by* $R(x) = D$, $R(u) = f^i(u)J^i$ *for* $u \in \mathfrak{a}(i)$ *and* $0 \leq i < m$, $R(u) = 0$ *for* $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ *and* $\delta \notin \{0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$, *yields an admissible uniserial* $\mathfrak{g}$*-module* U *of length* m *upon which* $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ *does not act trivially.*

Moreover any modification whatsoever to $m, \alpha, f^0, \ldots, f^{m-1}$ *that keeps* $f^1(v) = 1$ *produces a* $\mathfrak{g}$*-module non-isomorphic to* U.

Proof. The first assertion is obvious. As for the second, m is the composition length of U and α is the eigenvalue through which x acts on the socle of U, so m and α cannot be changed without changing the isomorphism type of U. Since $R(v) = J$ and the only matrices in $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ commuting with J are in $F[J]$, the linear functionals $f^0, \ldots, f^{m-1}$ cannot be changed either. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let* U *be an admissible uniserial* $\mathfrak{g}$*-module of composition length* m *not annihilated by* $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$. *Suppose that* F *has characteristic 0 or prime characteristic* $p \geq m$. *Then*

(1) $m = \dim(U) > 1$.

(2) *Let* S *be the set of eigenvalues* δ *of* $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ *acting on* $\mathfrak{a}$ *such that the corresponding eigenspace* $\mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ *does not act trivially on* U. *Then, after replacing* x *by a suitable scalar multiple,* $1 \in S$ *and every element of* S *is is an integer* i *satisfying* $0 \leq i < m$.

(3) *For each* $i \in S$ *let* $\mathfrak{b}(i)$ *be the subspace of* $\mathfrak{a}(i)$ *annihilating* U. *Then* $\mathfrak{b}(i)$ *is a hyperplane of* $\mathfrak{a}(i)$. *In particular, if* U *is faithful then every eigenvalue of* $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ *acting on* $\mathfrak{a}$ *must have multiplicity 1.*

(4) *Fix a non-zero* $v \in \mathfrak{a}(1)$. *Then there are linear functionals* $f^i : \mathfrak{a}(i) \to F$, $0 \leq i < m$, *such that* $f^1(v) = 1$, *and a basis of* U *relative to which* x *is represented by a diagonal matrix* $D = \mathrm{diag}(\alpha, \alpha - 1, \ldots, \alpha - (m-1))$ *for some* $\alpha \in F$ *and every* $u \in \mathfrak{a}(i)$, $0 \leq i < m$, *is represented by* $f^i(u)J^i$, *where* $J = J_m(0)$.

Proof. The centralizer of J in $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ is $F[J]$ and the eigenvalues of $\mathrm{ad}\, D$ on $F[J]$ are the integers i such that $0 \leq i < m$, with corresponding eigenspaces $F \cdot J^i$. The result now follows from Proposition 3.2. □

Note 3.5. Combining Proposition 3.3 with Theorem 3.4 we obtain a complete classification of all admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-modules of composition length m not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, provided $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$ or $\mathrm{char}(F) = p \geq m$.

Observe that part (2) of Theorem 3.4 is slightly better than the corresponding result from [CS3], Corollary 3.15, due to our use of Theorem 2.3 instead of [CS2], Theorem 3.1.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that* F *has prime characteristic* p. *Assume that* 1 *is an eigenvalue when* $\mathrm{ad}\, x$ *acts on* $\mathfrak{a}$ *and let* $v \in \mathfrak{a}$ *be a corresponding eiegenvalue. Given* $m > p$ *and* $\alpha \in F$, *set* $D = \mathrm{diag}(\alpha, \alpha - 1, \ldots, \alpha - (m-1))$, $J = J_m(0)$ *and let* $Y \in D + F[J^p]J$. *Let* $g^i : \mathfrak{a}(i) \to F[J^p]J^i$, $0 \leq i < p$, *be arbitrary linear maps subject only to* $g^1(v) = I$.

Then the linear map $R : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{gl}(m)$ defined by $R(x) = Y$, $R(u) = g^i(u)$ for $u \in \mathfrak{a}(i)$ and $0 \leq i < p$, $R(u) = 0$ for $u \in \mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ and $\delta \notin \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, defines an admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module U of length m upon which $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ does not act trivially.

Moreover, any modification whatsoever to $m, \alpha, Y, g^0, \dots, g^{m-1}$ that maintains $g^1(v) = I$ produces a $\mathfrak{g}$-module non-isomorphic to U.

Proof. The fact that R is a representation follows easily from (3.2). In regards to the second assertion, $m, \alpha, g^0, \dots, g^{p-1}$ cannot be changed without changing the isomorphism type of U for the same reasons exposed in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Moreover, by Proposition 3.1, the elements of $D + F[J^p]J$ are in different orbits under the conjugating action of the unit group of $F[J]$, so Y cannot be changed either. □

Note 3.7. By varying $Y \in D + F[J^p]J$ while taking all $g^i(u) \in F \cdot J^i$ we obtain infinitely many non-isomorphic $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, an impossible feature when $p \geq m$. The only choice in $D + F[J^p]J$ that makes x act diagonalizably on U is $Y = D$ (it is instructive to verify that none of the other matrices in $D+F[J^p]J$ is diagonalizable). In stark contrast, when $p \geq m$ it is impossible for x not to act diagonalizably on a uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, as shown in Theorem 3.4.

Note, as well, that there are infinitely many choices of $g^0, \dots, g^{p-1}$ such that $g^i(u) \notin F \cdot J^i$ for some i and u, all of which yield $\mathfrak{g}$-modules which have no analogue when $p \geq m$.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose that F has prime characteristic p. Let U is an admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-module of composition length $m > p$ not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$. Then*

(1) $m = \dim(U) > 1$.

(2) *Let S be the set of eigenvalues δ of $\operatorname{ad} x$ acting on $\mathfrak{a}$ such that the corresponding eigenspace $\mathfrak{a}(\delta)$ does not act trivially on U. Then, after replacing x by a suitable scalar multiple, $1 \in S$ and every element of S is in the prime subfield of F.*

(3) *Suppose that U is faithful and let i be an eigenvalue of $\operatorname{ad} x$ acting on $\mathfrak{a}$. Then the multiplicity of i is bounded above by $[\frac{m-(i+1)}{p}] + 1$.*

(4) *Fix a non-zero $v \in \mathfrak{a}(1)$. Then there are linear maps $g^i : \mathfrak{a}(i) \to F[J^p]J^i$, for $0 \leq i < p$, satisfying $g^1(v) = I$, a scalar $\alpha \in F$, a matrix $Y \in D + F[J^p]J$, where $J = J_m(0)$ and $D = \operatorname{diag}(\alpha, \alpha - 1, \cdots, \alpha - (m-1))$, and a basis of U relative to which x is represented by Y and every $u \in \mathfrak{a}(i)$, $0 \leq i < p$, is represented by $g^i(u)$.*

Proof. The centralizer of J in $\mathfrak{gl}(m)$ is $F[J]$, and the eigenvalues of $\operatorname{ad} D$ (and hence of $\operatorname{ad} Y$ for any $Y \in D + F[J^P]J$) on $F[J]$ comprise all of the prime subfield of F, with corresponding eigenspaces $F[J^p]J^i$ for $0 \leq i < p$. The result now follows from Proposition 3.2. □

Note 3.9. Combining Proposition 3.6 with Theorem 3.8 we obtain a complete classification of all admissible uniserial $\mathfrak{g}$-modules of composition length m not annihilated by $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ whenever F has prime characteristic $p < m$.

References

[CS] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman, *The classification of uniserial $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes V(m)$-modules and a new interpretation of the Racah-Wigner $6j$-symbol*, J. Algebra, 386 (2013) 142-175.

[CS2] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman, *On the theorem of the primitive element with applications to the representation theory of associative and Lie algebras*, Canad. Math. Bull., to appear.

[CS3] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman, *Classification of linked indecomposable modules of a family of solvable Lie algebras over an arbitrary field of characteristic 0*, submitted.

[CMS] P. Casati, S. Minniti and V. Salari, *Indecomposable representations of the Diamond Lie algebra* J. Math. Phys., 51 (2010) 033515, 20 pp.

[CM] V. Chari and A. Moura, *The restricted Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules for the current and twisted current algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys., 266 (2006) 431–454.

[DG] A. Douglas and H. de Guise, *Some nonunitary, indecomposable representations of the Euclidean algebra* $\mathfrak{e}(3)$, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 43 (2010) 085204, 13pp.

[DKR] A. Douglas, D. Kahrobaei and J. Repka, *Classification of embeddings of abelian extensions of D_n into E_{n+1}*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 217 (2013) 1942–1954.

[DP] A. Douglas and A. Premat, *A class of nonunitary, finite dimensional representations of the euclidean algebra* $\mathfrak{e}(2)$, Comm. Algebra, 35 (2007) 1433–1448.

[GP] I.M. Gelfand, V.A. Ponomarev, *Remarks on the classification of a pair of commuting linear transformations in a finite dimensional vector space*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **3** (1969) 325-326.

[H] J.E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie Algebras and Representation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.

[J] H. P. Jakobsen, *Indecomposable finite-dimensional representations of a class of Lie algebras and Lie superalgebras*, Supersymmetry in mathematics and physics, 125-138, Lecture Notes in Math., 2027, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[L] J. Louck, *Survey of zeros of 3j and 6j coefficients by Diophantine equation methods*, Group theory and special symmetries in nuclear physics (Ann Arbor, MI, 1991), 268-275, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1992.

[M] I. Makedonskyi, *On wild and tame finite-dimensinal Lie algebras*, Funct. Anal. Appl., 47 (2013) 271–283.

[Mc] P. J. McCarthy, *Algebraic extensions of fields*, Dover, New York, 1991.

[P] A. Piard, *Sur des représentations indécomposables de dimension finie de $SL(2).R^2$*, Journal of Geometry and Physics, 3 (1986) 1–53.

[R] J. Raynal, *On the zeros of 6-j coefficients*, J. Phys. A, 27 (1994) 3105–3127.

[S] A. Savage, *Quivers and the Euclidean group*, Contemp. Math., 478 (2009) 177-188.

CIEM-CONICET, FAMAF-Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina.
E-mail address: cagliero@famaf.unc.edu.ar

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Regina, Canada
E-mail address: fernando.szechtman@gmail.com